



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/632,024

07/31/2003

Gerard Chauvel

TI-35461

9347

23494 7590 01/28/2008  
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED  
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999  
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2145

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/28/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com  
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/632,024	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHAUVEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey R. Swearingen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on 11/13/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter et al. (US 6,194,940) in view of Clark et al. (US 6,519,707).

4. In regard to claim 1, Hunter disclosed a clock system using a wait-for-interrupt mode which combines the information of a current clock register and a previous status of a clock register for use in power saving mechanisms when a phone is in "sleep mode". Hunter, column 1, lines 24-35; column 3, lines 11-59; column 6, lines 8-27. Hunter failed to explicitly disclose the use of transactions targeting a "pre-determined address", even though the status in the clock registers were "addresses" per se. Hunter

Art Unit: 2145

showed the ability for a cell phone to be in "sleep mode" (a wait mode). Clark, in the analogous field of power control in cell phones (Clark, column 1, lines 21-33) disclosed "memory mapping" the control registers to various specified memory address locations, e.g. "targeting and detecting a pre-determined address". Clark, column 5, lines 6-25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Hunter with the teachings of Clark to allow for memory controlled access of addressed instructions, without incurring memory access conflicts or memory leaks.

5. In regard to claim 2, Clark further disclosed de-asserting the wait signal to permit the first processor to retrieve a status of the second processor. Clark, column 6, lines 1-27.

6. In regard to claim 3, Clark further disclosed the status includes one or more instructions that the first processor is to execute. Clark, column 6, lines 45-67.

7. In regard to claim 4, Hunter further disclosed said transaction comprises a read instruction. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-27 allowed the clock information in the status registers to be accessed.

8. In regard to claim 5, Hunter further disclosed said transaction comprises a write instruction. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-27 combined two pieces of clock information. The storing of the combined information is a write instruction.

9. In regard to claim 6, Hunter further disclosed said wait unit de-asserts the wait signal upon detection of a system interrupt signal generated by the first processor. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-13.

10. In regard to claim 7, Hunter further disclosed said wait unit de-asserts the wait signal upon detection of a signal from said second processor. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-13.

11. In regard to claim 8, Hunter further disclosed said wait unit upon detection of said signal asserts a processor interrupt signal to the first processor if the wait signal is already de-asserted. Hunter, column 6, lines 8-13.

12. Claim 9 is substantially the same as claims 1-2.

13. In regard to claim 10, Clark further disclosed a low power mode. Clark, column 4, lines 8-39.

14. Claim 11 is substantially the same as claim 6.

15. Claim 12 is substantially the same as claim 7.

16. Claim 13 is substantially the same as claim 4.

Art Unit: 2145

17. Claim 14 is substantially the same as claim 5.
18. Claim 15 is substantially the same as claim 1.
19. Claim 16 is substantially the same as claim 4.
20. Claim 17 is substantially the same as claim 5.
21. Claim 18 is substantially the same as claim 6.
22. Claim 19 is substantially the same as claim 7.
23. Claim 20 is substantially the same as claim 8.
24. Claim 21 is substantially the same as claim 9.
25. Claim 22 is substantially the same as claim 13.
26. Claim 23 is substantially the same as claim 14.
27. Claim 24 is substantially the same as claim 7.
28. Claim 25 is substantially the same as claim 8.

**35 USC § 101**

29. Applicant's claims and specification are limited to hardware embodiments. Applicant has not attempted to redefine a system, wait unit, or processor to encompass embodiments which are not within the statutory classes of invention.

**Conclusion**

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Evoy et al.	US 5,953,741
-------------	--------------

O'Connor et al.	US 6,026,485
-----------------	--------------

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2145

JRS

/Jason D Cardone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145